

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
#5 Most Recent Periodic Review Date	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 0 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 1 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 13 Alameda = 9	Contra Costa = 1 Riverside = 1 San Francisco = 1 Sacramento = 1 Alameda = 1	San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Santa Clara = 1	<p>Not found: San Bernardino = 1</p> <p>San Bernardino: The case marked as questionable was one the reviewer indicated was a probation case. The information in AFCARS was blank and the reviewer did not note whether a periodic review date was found. The date of removal for this case occurred in 2001 and the child's current living arrangement starting in 2001 through the end of the report period was a group home.</p> <p>Tulare: The questionable case had a review date reported in AFCARS, but the reviewer noted it was a continuance date. Unsure if this meant that the review was actually heard on that date.</p> <p>Riverside: The case marked as an error was a probation case. The date of latest removal was in 2002 and the child's present living arrangement is "runaway." Also, the State was claiming title IV-E foster care during the report period.</p> <p>Santa Clara: The questionable case has notes indicating the child exited foster care in 2000, however, the reviewer wrote in a periodic review date of July 2003.</p> <p>Sacramento: The date entered by the reviewer reflects a periodic review date. The date reported for AFCARS appears to reflect the date the dependency order was dismissed. Also, the date reported to AFCARS for a periodic review occurs</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**

**State: California**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
				after the date of discharge reported to AFCARS.
#6 Child Birth Date	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 10		Alameda = 1	
#7 Child Sex  1 = Male 2 = Female	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14			

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Alameda = 10			
#8 Child Race	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 4 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 10	San Francisco = 1 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 1		Not found: Santa Clara = 2  The error cases were due to not all races being selected.
#9 Child Hispanic Origin  1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 0 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 4 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 1 Placer = 0 Sacramento = 12	Tulare = 1 Los Angeles = 1 San Francisco = 4 Santa Clara = 2 San Joaquin = 2 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 2 Alameda = 4		Not Found: San Bernardino = 1; San Francisco = 1; Santa Clara = 1; Alameda = 5  Number of records that indicated “unable to determine” in AFCARS and the reviewer found the information in the paper file: 11 (San Joaquin (2); Placer (1); Alameda (4); Sacramento (1); Santa Clara (2); San Francisco (3); Los Angeles (1); Tulare (1)).  San Francisco, Santa Clara and Alameda: In the records that the reviewers were not able to find, the information for each of the AFCARS records was “unable to determine.”

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Alameda = 1			Alameda: One record was a probation case.
#10 Has Child Been Diagnosed with a Disability?	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 12 Alameda = 7	San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 2 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 1 Alameda = 3		Sacramento = 1  San Francisco, Santa Clara, Sutter and Alameda: In each of the error cases the AFCARS indicated “no” and the reviewers indicated “yes.”  Sacramento: The error case was marked as “yes” in AFCARS, but the reviewer found no diagnosed disabilities that would be applicable for this element.
#11 Mental Retardation	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 4 Placer = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 14			

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Alameda = 10			
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 4 Placer = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 10	Santa Clara = 2		Santa Clara: The records in error should have been “does not apply” not “apply.”
#13 Physically Disabled	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 4 Placer = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 14			

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Alameda = 10			
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 2 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 13 Alameda = 7	Contra Costa = 1 Los Angeles = 1 Santa Clara = 5 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 1 Alameda = 3		The errors were due to conditions mapped to the wrong category.  Santa Clara: Two error cases had “no” for element #10 and conditions were found that would be mapped to this element.  Alameda: The error cases had “no” for element #10 and conditions were found that would be mapped to this element.
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 4 Placer = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 8	Contra Costa = 1 Los Angeles = 1 San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 2 Sacramento = 6		Santa Clara: One error case had “no” for element #10 and conditions were found that would be mapped to this element. The other error was due to mis-mapping.  Sacramento: All the error cases were marked as “applies” and the response should have been “does not apply.”

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Alameda = 10			
<b>#16 Has Child Ever Been Adopted?</b>  1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 0 Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 1 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 0 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 1 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 2 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 12 Alameda = 1	San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 1 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 2 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 2 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 2 Alameda = 6	San Francisco = 2	Not found: Contra Costa = 1; San Diego = 1; Alameda = 3  In eleven of the error cases, the AFCARS report indicated “unable to determine” and the reviewers indicated “no” for each case.  In one of the error cases for Riverside, the AFCARS response was “no” but the reviewer indicated “yes.”  The two cases listed as questionable had “unable to determine” reported to AFCARS and the reviewer also noted “unable to determine.” However, in neither case was the child abandoned.  Sutter: Probation case.
<b>#17 Age at Previous Adoption</b>  0 = Not Applicable 1 = less than 2 years old 2 = 2-5 years old 3 = 6-12 years old 4 = 13 years or older 5 = Unable to Determine	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 1 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 1 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 4 Placer = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 14	Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 1 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 1		Not found: Contra Costa = 1; San Diego = 1

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Alameda = 10			
#18 Date of First Removal from Home	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 3 San Joaquin = 1 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 6 Alameda = 7	San Bernardino = 1 Contra Costa = 1 San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 4 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 8 Alameda = 3		<p>Not found: Contra Costa = 1</p> <p>San Bernardino: In the error case, the reviewer indicated that the child was arrested on the date reported to AFCARS as the removal date. The child was initially placed at a detention center. The child then went to a group home. The removal date should have been the date the child entered the group home.</p> <p>Contra Costa: In the error case, the reviewer found an earlier date of removal than the one reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>San Francisco: In the error case, the actual date of removal was a month earlier than what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>Santa Clara: In two of the error cases, the date of first removal was four or more years prior to what was reported in AFCARS. The remaining errors may be court order dates and not actual removal-from-home dates.</p> <p>Sacramento: There were three error cases that the date found by the reviewer was between one and eight years earlier than the date reported in AFCARS. The record with the difference of eight years indicated the child was removed in 1988 and the AFCARS indicates 1996.</p>
#19 Total Number of	Stanislaus = 2	Tulare = 1	Santa Clara = 1	Not found: Contra Costa = 1



**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
Removals from Home	San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 1 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 4 San Joaquin = 4 Placer = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 9 Alameda = 9	Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 1 Riverside = 1 San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 2 Sacramento = 4 Alameda = 1	Sacramento = 1	<p>Tulare: It appears from the reviewers notes that the error case had only one removal. AFCARS indicated two removals from the home. It may be that the change in living arrangements was entered as a discharge from the agency's care and placement responsibility.</p> <p>Contra Costa: In the error case, the AFCARS data indicates three removals from home but the reviewer found the child had only one removal. The child had been placed with a relative, but the agency maintained responsibility for care and placement.</p> <p>San Diego: The error case indicated more removals in AFCARS than what were found by the reviewer.</p> <p>Riverside: The reviewer found fewer number of removals than what were reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>San Francisco: There were more removals than what was reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>Santa Clara: The number of removals found by the reviewer was greater than what was reported to AFCARS. For the questionable case, it is difficult to discern from the notes whether the child had one or two removals. There appears to be a placement at a "Children's Shelter" starting in 1992 and ending in 1996. From there, the child went to a family foster home. However, the reviewer's notes indicate the child had been living with a non-relative male. It is not clear if the child had runaway from the shelter.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
				<p>Sacramento: In three of the error cases, the reviewers found fewer removals than what were reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>Alameda: The error cases had more removals than what was reported to AFCARS.</p>
#20 Date of Discharge from Previous Episode	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 1 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 2 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 8 Alameda = 9	Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 1 Riverside = 1 San Francisco = 1 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 3 San Joaquin = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 5 Alameda = 1	Santa Clara = 1 Sacramento = 1	<p>Not found: Santa Clara = 1</p> <p>Tulare: See the note above. AFCARS indicated a date of discharge, which was the day before the date for the latest removal from home.</p> <p>Contra Costa: In the error case the AFCARS data indicates three removals from home, but the reviewer found that the child had only one removal. The child had been placed with a relative, but the agency maintained responsibility for care and placement.</p> <p>Riverside: The reviewer found a later date for this element than what was reported. Also, the date for this element was one day <u>before</u> the date of the first removal from home (#18).</p> <p>Tuolumne: The finding is based on the dates written in by the reviewer. It appears that the child's grandmother obtained legal guardianship of the child and the child re-entered foster care from her care.</p> <p>Santa Clara: For the questionable case, it is difficult to discern from the notes whether the child had one or two removals.</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
				<p>Sacramento: Four of the error cases were due to the reviewer finding that the child had only one removal.</p> <p>There were a couple of cases in which the date of discharge from the previous removal episode did not reflect that the child had been placed in his/her own home while under the agency's responsibility plus six months from the date the child went home.</p>
#21 Date of Latest Removal	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 1 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 3 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 4 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 6 Alameda = 8	San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 1 Riverside = 1 San Francisco = 2 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 2 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 7 Alameda = 2	Los Angeles = 1 Santa Clara = 1 Sacramento = 1	<p>San Bernardino: In the error case, the reviewer indicated that the child was arrested on the date reported to AFCARS as the removal date and initially placed at a detention center. The child then went to a group home. The removal date should have been the date the child entered the group home.</p> <p>Tulare: It appears from the reviewers notes that the error case had only one removal. AFCARS indicated two removals from home. It may be that the change in living arrangements was entered as a discharge from the agency's care and placement responsibility.</p> <p>Contra Costa: In the error case, the reviewer AFCARS data indicates three removals from home, but the reviewer found that the child had only one removal. The child had been placed with a relative, but the agency maintained responsibility for care and placement.</p> <p>San Diego: In the error case the reviewer found an earlier date of removal than what was reported in</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
				<p>AFCARS.</p> <p>Los Angeles: In the questionable case, it is unclear from the reviewer's notes if the date reported to AFCARS is correct. It appears to be incorrect and the date of latest removal occurred later than what was reported in AFCARS. According to the reviewers notes, there is a six-month gap in the placement history.</p> <p>Tuolumne: The finding is based on the dates written in by the reviewer. It appears that the child's grandmother obtained legal guardianship of the child and since then the child has re-entered foster care.</p> <p>Santa Clara: For the questionable case, it is difficult to discern from the notes whether the child had one or two removals.</p> <p>Sacramento: In three of the cases found in error the dates of latest removal were between one and eight years earlier than what was reported in AFCARS. The record with the difference of eight years indicated the child was removed in 1988 and the AFCARS indicates 1996.</p>
#23 Date of Placement in Current Setting	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2	Tulare = 0 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 2 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 3	Tuolumne = 1	<p>Not found: Sacramento = 1</p> <p>Orange: A change of address was extracted as a new placement date.</p> <p>San Francisco: In the error case, the date of current placement was significantly later than what was</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Orange = 1 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 10 Alameda = 5	Alameda = 5		<p>reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>Sutter: The error case reflects a date over a year later than what is reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>Sacramento: In one case the child had been returned home while the agency maintained responsibility for care and placement. The date in the AFCARS record reflected the date of the previous setting. One of the errors was in the case where the child had been removed earlier than the date reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>Alameda: In two error records, the reviewer found dates later than what was reported to AFCARS. In one the difference was a year and the child had more placements than what was reported. In another error case, the year reported to AFCARS was later than the one found by the reviewer.</p>
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in This Episode	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 1 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 1 Orange = 0 San Francisco = 2 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 2 San Joaquin = 1 Sutter = 0	Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 1 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 2 Santa Clara = 3 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 7 Alameda = 3	Santa Clara = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 1	<p>Not found: Santa Clara = 1; Sacramento = 1; San Francisco = 1</p> <p>Contra Costa: The number of placements found by the reviewer was greater than the number reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>San Diego: In one instance, the number of placements was over-counted in AFCARS and in the other it was under-counted.</p> <p>Los Angeles: The number of placements was less than what was reported to AFCARS.</p>

# AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County

State: California

Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Placer = 0 Sacramento = 5 Alameda = 7			<p>Riverside: There were more placements found than what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>Orange: In one instance, the reviewer found fewer placements and in the other more placements than what was reported to AFCARS. Orange: A change of address was extracted as a new placement date.</p> <p>San Francisco: One case was not analyzed because the reviewer was not able to complete the placement count before the case went back to the county.</p> <p>Santa Clara: In the error cases, two had fewer moves than what was reported in AFCARS and one had more moves.</p> <p>San Joaquin: In two of the error cases, the number of moves was more than what was reported in AFCARS. The third one had fewer moves than reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>Sacramento: All but one of the cases marked incorrect increased in the number of placements.</p> <p>Alameda: In two of the error cases, the number of placements was greater than what was reported in AFCARS.</p>
<p>#25 Manner of Removal From Home for This Episode</p> <p>1 = Voluntary</p>	<p>Stanislaus = 2</p> <p>San Bernardino = 2</p> <p>Tulare = 2</p> <p>Contra Costa = 3</p> <p>San Diego = 3</p>	San Francisco = 1		

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined	Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 4 Placer = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 10			
#26 Physical Abuse	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 11 Alameda = 10	Tulare = 1 San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 1 Sacramento = 3	San Joaquin = 1	In each of the error cases, the reviewer noted the response should have been "applies."  San Joaquin: In the questionable cases the reviewer indicated all of the conditions as "does not apply."
#27 Sexual Abuse	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3	Santa Clara = 1 Alameda = 1	San Joaquin = 1	

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 9			
#28 Neglect	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 2 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 10 Alameda = 10	San Bernardino = 1 Contra Costa = 1 Los Angeles = 1 Orange = 1 Santa Clara = 2 Sacramento = 4	San Joaquin = 1	San Bernardino and Los Angeles: In the error cases, the AFCARS data indicates “applies,” but the reviewer indicates “does not apply.”  Contra Costa and Orange: The error cases should have been “applies.”
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3	Santa Clara = 2 Sacramento = 1	San Joaquin = 1	



**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 13 Alameda = 10			
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 0 Riverside = 2 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 5 Santa Clara = 2 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 0 Placer = 0 Sacramento = 5 Alameda = 6	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 1 San Diego = 1 Los Angeles = 2 Orange = 1 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 1 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 9 Alameda = 4	San Joaquin = 1	The error cases should have been "applies."
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2	Santa Clara = 2	San Joaquin = 1	

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 10			
#32 Child Drug Abuse	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 13 Alameda = 10	Sacramento = 1	San Joaquin = 1	
#33 Child Disability	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2		San Joaquin = 1	

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 10			
#34 Child's Behavior Problem	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 12 Alameda = 9	San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Santa Clara = 2 Sacramento = 2 Alameda = 1	San Joaquin = 1	The error case for San Bernardino and Santa Clara should have been "applies."  Tulare: The error case should have been "does not apply."  Sacramento: One of the error cases should have been "does not apply" and the other should have been "applies."
#35 Death of Parent	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2	Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 1	San Joaquin = 1	

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 3 Placer = 1 Sutter = 0 Sacramento = 13 Alameda = 10			
#36 Incarceration of Parent	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 12 Alameda = 9	San Bernardino = 1 San Diego = 1 Orange = 1 Santa Clara = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 2 Alameda = 1	San Joaquin = 1	In the error cases, the reviewer noted it should have been "applies."
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2	San Bernardino = 1 Santa Clara = 1 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 2 Alameda = 1	San Joaquin = 1	Not found: Contra Costa = 1  The error cases for Santa Clara and Alameda should have been "does not apply" and not "apply."  The other error cases should have been "applies,"

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 12 Alameda = 9			not “does not apply.”
#38 Abandonment	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 10	Orange = 1 Santa Clara = 2	San Joaquin = 1	Orange: The error case should have been “applies.”  Santa Clara: One of the error cases should have been “does not apply.”
#39 Relinquishment	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2		San Joaquin = 1	

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 10			
#40 Inadequate Housing	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 1 Riverside = 2 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 10 Alameda = 9	San Bernardino = 1 Los Angeles = 1 Orange = 1 Santa Clara = 1 San Joaquin = 1 Sacramento = 4 Alameda = 1	San Joaquin = 1	In the error cases, the condition should have been applies.
#41 Current Placement Setting  1 = Pre-Adoptive Home 2 = Foster Family Home (Relative)	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2	Tulare = 1 Sacramento = 1 Alameda = 1	San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 1	Not found: Santa Clara = 1  Sacramento: In one case, the child had been returned home while the agency maintained responsibility for care and placement. The date in the AFCARS record reflected the date of the previous setting.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
3 = Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) 4 = Group Home 5 = Institution 6 = Supervised Independent Living 7 = Runaway 8 = Trial Home Visit	Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 13 Alameda = 9			Alameda: The reviewer indicated the child was placed with parents while still in the care and placement responsibility of the agency.
#42 Out of State Placement	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 10			
#43 Most Recent Case Plan Goal  1 = Reunify with Parent(s) or Principal Caretaker(s) 2 = Live with Other	Stanislaus = 0 San Bernardino = 0 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 0 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 1	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 San Diego = 3 Riverside = 1 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5	San Bernardino = 1 Sacramento = 1	Stanislaus: In both of the error cases, the goal reported to AFCARS was "reunify." The reviewer indicated a goal of "long term foster care" for one case and "adoption" for the other. In the one where adoption was noted as the goal, the child also exited from care due to an adoption.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long Term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established	Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 2 San Joaquin = 0 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 7 Alameda = 6	San Joaquin = 4 Sacramento = 6 Alameda = 4		<p>San Bernardino: The case marked in error had “case plan goal not yet established” in AFCARS and the reviewer indicated a goal of “adoption.” The questionable case is one indicated as a probation case. The AFCARS indicated a “case plan goal not yet established” and the reviewer did not indicate if there was a goal.</p> <p>Tulare: In the error case the child was removed in May of 2003 and AFCARS file indicates “case plan goal not yet established.” However, the child’s current living arrangement was “trial home visit” and the reviewer indicated a goal of “maintain in own home.” Since the child had been in care for more than 60 days, a case plan goal should have been established. It appears the goal would be “reunify.”</p> <p>San Diego: There was one error case that indicated “case plan goal not yet established” in AFCARS and the child had been in out-of-home care for at least a year. In the other two error cases the goals were “reunify.” However, in one the reviewer indicated a goal of “adoption” and in the other “permanent placement with relative.”</p> <p>Riverside: The case marked as an error was a probation case. The date of latest removal was in 2002 and the child’s present living arrangement is “runaway.” Also, the State was claiming title IV-E foster care during the report period.</p>



**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
				<p>Santa Clara: In three of the error cases the goal reported in AFCARS was “reunify.” The reviewers indicated that the goal was “long-term foster care” and/or “live with relative.” One record indicated a goal of “long-term foster care” in AFCARS, but the child had been returned home.</p> <p>San Joaquin: All four of the error cases had “case plan goal not yet established” reported in AFCARS. However, the reviewers did find goals for each of the cases. Three were “long term foster care” and the fourth was “adoption.” Three of the four cases had dates of removal greater than a year prior to the end of the report period. One had a date of removal in 1994.</p> <p>Sacramento: One case has a date of latest removal in 2001 and the response in AFCARS was “case plan goal not yet established.” There were two cases that the AFCARS data indicates “reunify,” but in one case the reviewer indicates “long term foster care” and the other “adoption.” One record was reported as “long term foster care” and the reviewer indicated a goal of “adoption.”</p> <p>Sacramento: Reported as “reunify,” but the reviewer found to “long-term foster care.”</p>
<p>#44 Caretaker Family Structure</p> <p>1 = Married Couple</p>	<p>Stanislaus = 1</p> <p>San Bernardino = 1</p> <p>Tulare = 0</p> <p>Contra Costa = 2</p>	<p>Stanislaus = 1</p> <p>San Bernardino = 1</p> <p>Tulare = 1</p> <p>San Diego = 1</p>	<p>Tulare = 1</p> <p>San Joaquin = 1</p>	<p>Not found: Contra Costa = 1; Alameda = 2</p> <p>The questionable cases indicate “unable to determine” in AFCARS, but “abandonment” was</p>

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine	San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 0 Riverside = 0 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 1 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 3 San Joaquin = 1 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 11 Alameda = 0	Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 4 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 3 Alameda = 8		not selected as a reason for removal. The reviewer did not note any information.  San Diego and Tuolumne: The AFCARS data indicated “unable to determine” and the reviewers indicated “married couple.”  Los Angeles: In both of the error cases, the AFCARS data indicates “unable to determine.” However, the reviewers were able to find the information in the case file.  Riverside: The error cases had “unable to determine” in AFCARS and the reviewer found the information.  San Francisco: Three of the error cases indicated “unable to determine,” but the reviewers found information.  Santa Clara: All of the error cases were reported to AFCARS as “unable to determine.” The reviewers found information on the caretakers.  San Joaquin: One error case indicated “unable to determine,” but the reviewers found the information.  Sacramento: In all of the records the information reported to AFCARS was “unable to determine.” The reviewers were able to find information in eight cases.
#45 1 <sup>st</sup> Primary	Stanislaus = 1	San Bernardino = 1	Tulare = 1	Not found: Stanislaus = 1; Alameda = 2

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
Caretaker's Birth Year	San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 0 Riverside = 0 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 1 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 3 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 0 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 11 Alameda = 0	San Diego = 1 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 1 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 4 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 3 Alameda = 8		San Diego: The AFCARS data indicated spaces and the reviewers found a date of birth.  Los Angeles: In both of the error cases the AFCARS data indicates “unable to determine.” However, the reviewers were able to find the information in the case file.  Riverside: The error cases had “unable to determine” in AFCARS and the reviewer found the information.  Santa Clara: All of the error cases were reported to AFCARS as “unable to determine.” The reviewers found information on the caretakers.  Sutter: The error care indicated “unable to determine” in AFCARS, but the reviewer found the parent’s date of birth.
#46 2 <sup>nd</sup> Primary Caretaker's Birth Year	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 1 Tulare = 1 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 3 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 7 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 0	San Bernardino = 1 San Diego = 1 San Francisco = 2 Tuolumne = 1 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 1 Sacramento = 1 Alameda = 1	Tulare = 1 Alameda = 2	Not found: Stanislaus = 1;  San Diego: The AFCARS data indicated spaces and the reviewers found a date of birth.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**

**State: California**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Placer = 1 Sacramento = 13 Alameda = 7			
#47 Mother's Date of TPR	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 9 Alameda = 8	Stanislaus = 1 Santa Clara = 1 San Joaquin = 1 Sacramento = 5 Alameda = 2		Stanislaus: In the error case, the reviewer found dates of TPR and the child had exited care due to adoption.  San Diego: In the case where the goal should have been adoption, the information was correct for elements #47 and 48.
#48 Father's Date of TPR	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 3 Sutter = 1	Stanislaus = 1 Santa Clara = 1 San Joaquin = 1 Sacramento = 4 Alameda = 2		

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	Placer = 1 Sacramento = 10 Alameda = 8			
<b>#49 Foster Family Structure</b>  0 = Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 3 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 1 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 12 Alameda = 7	Stanislaus = 1 San Diego = 1 San Francisco = 2 Santa Clara = 1 San Joaquin = 3 Sacramento = 2 Alameda = 2		Not found: Alameda = 1  Stanislaus: The child was placed in a foster home and the information for elements #49 - 55 was missing information on the foster parents. The reviewer indicated the foster parents were a "married couple."  San Francisco and San Joaquin: One of the error cases was missing the data in AFCARS and the reviewer found the data. In the other case, the foster parents were a married couple, not a single female.  Sacramento: The error cases were missing the data in AFCARS, but the reviewer found the data.  Alameda: The data was missing in AFCARS, but the reviewers found the information.
<b>#50 1<sup>st</sup> Foster Caretaker's Birth Year</b>	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 1 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 1 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6	Stanislaus = 1 San Diego = 2 San Francisco = 3 Santa Clara = 1 San Joaquin = 2 Sacramento = 6 Alameda = 5		Not found: Contra Costa = 1; San Francisco = 1; San Joaquin = 1  San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Clara, Sacramento and Alameda: The date of birth information was missing in AFCARS even though the children were in family foster home settings.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	San Joaquin = 1 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 8 Alameda = 5			
#51 2 <sup>nd</sup> Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 2 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 3 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 1 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 11 Alameda = 8	Stanislaus = 1 San Diego = 1 San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 1 San Joaquin = 3 Sacramento = 1 Alameda = 2	San Francisco = 1 Sacramento = 1	Not found: Contra Costa = 1; Sacramento = 1  The error records generally indicated that the child was in a family foster home. The data reported in AFCARS or found by the reviewer indicated the foster family structure was either a "married" or "unmarried couple."
#52 1 <sup>st</sup> Foster Caretaker's Race	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 1 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 3 Tuolumne = 0 Santa Clara = 4	Stanislaus = 1 San Diego = 0 San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 2 San Joaquin = 4 Sacramento = 5 Alameda = 5		Not found: San Diego = 2 (Also, data was missing in AFCARS.); San Francisco = 1; Tuolumne = 1; Santa Clara = 1; Sacramento = 1  San Joaquin: In three of the records, the data was missing and the child was in a foster home. One record did not have all appropriate races selected.  Alameda: All were reported as missing data and in one case the information was found by the reviewer.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**

**State: California**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	San Joaquin = 0 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 8 Alameda = 5			
#53 1 <sup>st</sup> Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 0 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 2 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 4 San Joaquin = 1 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 7 Alameda = 5	Stanislaus = 1 San Diego = 1 San Francisco = 1 Santa Clara = 3 San Joaquin = 3 Sacramento = 6 Alameda = 5		Not found: San Diego = 2 (Also, data was missing in AFCARS.); San Francisco = 2; Sacramento = 1  San Joaquin: In three of the records, the data was missing and the child was in a foster home. In one record, the reviewer indicates the individual is Hispanic.
#54 2 <sup>nd</sup> Foster Caretaker's Race	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 5	Stanislaus = 1 San Joaquin = 2 Sacramento = 1 Alameda = 2	Santa Clara = 1 Sacramento = 2 Alameda = 1	Not found: San Diego = 1 (Also, data was missing in AFCARS.); San Francisco = 1; Santa Clara = 1

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 11 Alameda = 7			
#55 2 <sup>nd</sup> Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	Stanislaus = 1 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 2 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 4 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 6 San Joaquin = 2 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 11 Alameda = 7	Stanislaus = 1 San Diego = 1 Santa Clara = 1 San Joaquin = 2 Sacramento = 1 Alameda = 2	Sacramento = 2 Alameda = 1	Not Found: San Francisco = 1
#56 Date of Discharge	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 3	Santa Clara = 4 Sacramento = 2 Alameda = 1		Santa Clara: One of the cases marked as an error had a date of discharge after the end of the report period. In one case, the reviewer indicated the child discharged from care in 2000. In a third case, the AFCARS indicates the child was still in care and the reviewer indicated the child was discharged in August. Another record indicated emancipation as a reason for discharge and the AFCARS was blank.  Sacramento: In one error case, the date reported to AFCARS reflects the date of the periodic review.



**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**  
**State: California**  
**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
	San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 12 Alameda = 9			The child was on a “trial home visit” and the dependency order was not dismissed until two months later.  Alameda: The reviewer indicated the child was placed with parents while still in the care and placement responsibility of the agency.
#58 Reason for Discharge  0 = Not Applicable 1 = Reunification with Parent(s) or Primary Caretaker(s) 2 = Living with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Emancipation 5 = Guardianship 6 = Transfer to Another Agency 7 = Runaway 8 = Death of Child	Stanislaus = 2 San Bernardino = 2 Tulare = 2 Contra Costa = 3 San Diego = 3 Los Angeles = 2 Riverside = 2 Orange = 2 San Francisco = 5 Tuolumne = 1 Santa Clara = 4 San Joaquin = 4 Sutter = 1 Placer = 1 Sacramento = 14 Alameda = 9	Santa Clara = 3 Alameda = 1		Santa Clara: One of the error cases indicated a date of discharge that occurred after the end of the report period. One case the reviewer indicated the child exited care in 2000 and the AFCARS record indicates the child is still in care. Another record indicated “emancipation” as a reason for discharge and the AFCARS was blank.  Alameda: The reviewer indicated the child was placed with parents while still in the care and placement responsibility of the agency.
#59 Title IVE Foster Care #60 Title IVE Adoption #61 Title IVA AFDC #62 Title IVD Child Support #63 Title XIX Medicaid				These elements were not analyzed. However, in one case from Tulare the amount reported in #66 was 0042 and the child was living in a group home. The State may want to further investigate this case.

**AFCARS ASSESSMENT REVIEW: Foster Care Case File Findings by County**

**State: California**

**Report Period Under Review: April 1, 2003 - September 30, 2003 (2003B)**

Data Element	Paper and AFCARS File Match	Paper and AFCARS File Do Not Match	Questionable	Comments/Notes
#64 SSI #65 None of the Above #66 Monthly Amount				

### **Listing of Counties and Number of Records Analyzed**

Stanislaus = 2

San Bernardino = 2

Tulare = 2

Contra Costa = 3

San Diego = 3

Los Angeles = 2

Riverside = 2

Orange = 2

San Francisco = 5

Tuolumne = 1

Santa Clara = 7

San Joaquin = 4

Sutter = 1

Placer = 1

Sacramento = 14

Alameda = 10